

Asheville-Buncombe Historic Resources Commission Meeting  
Minutes of January 14, 2015  
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall  
4:00 p.m.

**Present:** Chair Brendan Ross; David Carpenter, Nan Chase, William Eakins, Richard Fast, Bryan Moffitt and David Nutter.

**Absent:** Woodard Farmer, Tracey Rizzo, Joanne Stephenson and Amanda Warren

**Administrative**

- Mr. Nutter moved to approve the minutes of the December 10, 2014, meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.
- All those present in the audience and staff who anticipated speaking were sworn in.

**Consent Agenda** - None

**Public Hearing**

**Certificate of Appropriateness - Local Landmark - 60 Caledonia Road**

<b>Owner/Applicant:</b>	Asheville Holdings #1 LLC/Curtis Walk, Legerton Architecture
<b>Subject Property:</b>	60 Caledonia Road
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	January 14, 2015
<b>Historic District:</b>	Kenilworth Inn - Local Historic Landmark
<b>PIN:</b>	9648.72-2062
<b>Zoning District:</b>	RM-16

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the following staff report, noting that there was a preliminary review of this in November.

**Property Description:** This is the Kenilworth Inn, built in 1918, a rare example of a commercial style Tudor Revival, believed to be designed by Ronald Green. The structure has a granite foundation with stucco upper walls and brick quoins, accentuated with hip and shed style dormers, a massive granite porte cochere, and granite wrap-around terraces. The Kenilworth Inn was built as a Luxury Hotel but used as a mental health facility known as Appalachian Hall from 1931 until 2000. It also served as a military hospital during both World Wars. The setting in its entirety is significant and included in the designation as a local landmark.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Request:** Construct two new accessory structures per provided plans and specifications. Building A will be a 1-story four/five bay parking structure with a brick water table pebbledash siding and brick quoins. Roof will be hipped-style with clipped gable ends and covered with architectural fiberglass shingles to match existing on Kenilworth Inn. Windows will be fixed aluminum clad. Garage doors will be carriage style of painted molded steel with wood surrounds. Building B will be a 1-story, 6 bay parking structure with 8 additional storage spaces. It will have a brick water table, pebbledash siding and brick quoins. Roof will be hipped-style with clipped gable ends and covered with architectural fiberglass shingles to match existing color of Kenilworth Inn, except for standing seam metal over front shed dormer. Windows will be fixed aluminum clad. Garage doors will be carriage style of painted molded steel with wood surrounds. Pedestrian doors will be painted molded fiberglass. Construct new concrete sidewalk and steps. Flexible development approved to allow building A to be located 4 feet from the east/rear property line. Remove four hemlock trees. Install two interior partition walls per provided drawings. Walls will be installed in lobby to create interior offices and will consist of a raised wood

paneled base with wood sill and wood trimmed clear glazed panels and transom topped with gypsum board and wood trimmed soffit. The existing casework and shelves will remain and new work will be fitted to historic materials and assembled to avoid damage to historic fabric. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

**HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:**

1. Windows and door specifications are required.
2. New trees should be planted to replace the trees to be removed.
3. A decision by the Commission on whether Building A will be a four or five bay

*The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings* with emphasis on Building Site, Setting and Interior spaces, Features and Finishes was used to evaluate this request. It is not recommended to introduce a new building to the site that is out of scale or of an otherwise inappropriate design. It is not recommended to introduce new construction that is visually incompatible, or that destroys historic relationships within the setting. It is also not recommended to remove a historic building or landscape feature that is important in defining the historic character of the setting.

*UDO Section 7-11-7 © Flexible development standards permitted (4) for Structures undergoing design review* was also used to evaluate this request. Structures or lots subject to design review pursuant to this chapter by any official design review board established in this chapter which are found to comply with the applicable design guidelines shall be exempt from the signage, open space, landscaping, off-street parking, setback, building height and building floor area, lot width, and lot area requirements of the underlying zoning district to the extent that those requirements conflict with the applicable design guidelines.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the request for the following reasons: (1) The new structures are in scale and designed to be compatible with the existing structures on the site; (2) The new structures are set back behind the existing primary structure and maintain the historic relationships of structures within the setting; (3) New trees will be planted to maintain the character of the setting; and (4) The interior changes do not damage or obscure interior spaces, features or finishes and can easily be removed without damaging historic fabric.

There was discussion on whether to allow a five or four bay on Building A. Ms. Merten said that at the November meeting, the Commission wanted Building A to be moved more towards the rear. The applicant is requesting five bays; however, if the Commission is unwilling to grant five bays, the applicant will move forward with four bays. Ms. Merten's recommendation is for the four bay building because it would be less overwhelming on the site and back further towards the rear.

Mr. Curtis Walk, representing Legerton Architecture, presented the Commission with a package of information including a key plan of the five bay Building A, different three dimensional models of the Buildings A and B from different vantage points on the site, and three submittal pieces for the doors and windows.

Mr. Walk felt the the site could almost handle up to eight bays because once you've interrupted the site by constructing a building, five bays gives the sense of less scattered buildings on the site. He said it is a 10-foot difference from five bays to four bays.

In response to Mr. Nutter, Mr. Walk said that the owner wants to lease out the spaces to their tenants so the more bays they have, the more rent they can receive.

Mr. Carpenter felt Building A is a very large commercial space in a unique context. To him, it almost strengthens the argument for five bays, as long as the fifth bay moves towards the rear of the building and doesn't become more visible from the front.

Ms. Chase agreed that with five bays, the mass of the building would look better.

Mr. Walk also provided the Commissioners a large drawing showing where five additional trees would have to be removed, including the four hemlock trees that would need to be removed. He noted that the hemlocks and other trees are reaching the ends of their lives. They will meet the standard for planting new trees and have them located in places where they will not be so vulnerable.

Chair Ross opened the public hearing at 4:24 p.m., and when no one spoke, she closed the public hearing at 4:24 p.m.

Mr. Carpenter said that when you visit the site and see the space and the mass of the main building, having a smaller structure almost seems less appropriate. He would support five bays, as long as the building is set back so that the line of the fifth bay goes toward the rear.

Mr. Moffitt provided the Commissioners with a sketch of the building showing the viewshed of four bays vs. five bays. He didn't feel the visual impact of five bays (approximately 10 feet) is very different than the visual impact of four bays.

Ms. Merten acknowledged that she recommended four bays but she agreed with the comments made in favor of five bays, and could recommend five bays.

There was discussion, initiated by Mr. Moffitt, about the applicant mimicking the detail of the original structure around the windows and door openings, or just to reference the structure. Ms. Merten said that because these are garages, her recommendation would be for a more simple design that referenced the existing structure. Mr. Carpenter noted that that is within the guidelines.

Chair Ross would be amenable with five bays if the fifth bay were moved closer to the rear of the building. Mr. Curtis said that the fifth bay has been moved back approximately 50 feet from where it was but the biggest issue is the backing out of the parking spaces.

Mr. Nutter supported approval for the five bays.

#### **MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – flexible development application; Exhibit B – cover sheet; Exhibit C – (3 sheets) site plans including existing conditions, schematic and alternate schematic; Exhibit D – building B floor plan; Exhibit E – building A floor plan; Exhibit F – (3 sheets) elevations; Exhibit G – (2 sheets) comparative elevations ; Exhibit H – 6 photographs; Exhibit I - (6 sheets) 5 views of building and key, submitted 1-14-15; and Exhibit J - (3 sheets) 3 photos; and Exhibit K - 5 sheets window and door specs submitted on 1-14-15, Ms. Chase moved that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 29th day of December 2014, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 23rd day of December, 2014 as indicated by Exhibits L and M.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

3. That the application is to: Construct two new accessory structures per attached plans and specifications. Building A will be a 1-story five bay parking structure with a brick water table pebbledash siding and brick quoins. Roof will be hipped-style with clipped gable ends and covered with architectural fiberglass shingles to match existing on Kenilworth Inn. Windows will be fixed aluminum clad. Garage doors will be carriage style of painted molded steel with wood surrounds. Building B will be a 1-story, 6 bay parking structure with 8 additional storage spaces. It will have a brick water table, pebbledash siding and brick quoins. Roof will be hipped-style with clipped gable ends and covered with architectural fiberglass shingles to match existing color of Kenilworth Inn, except for standing seam metal over front shed dormer. Windows will be fixed aluminum clad. Garage doors will be carriage style of painted molded steel with wood surrounds. Pedestrian doors will be painted molded fiberglass. Construct new concrete sidewalk and steps. Flexible development approved to allow building A to be located 4 feet from the east/rear property line. Remove four hemlock trees and five additional trees (one white pine, two holly and two deciduous). Walls will be installed in lobby to create interior offices and will consist of a raised wood paneled base with wood sill and wood trimmed clear glazed panels and transom topped with gypsum board and wood trimmed soffit. The existing casework and shelves will remain and new work will be fitted to historic materials and assembled to avoid damage to historic fabric. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings, with emphasis on Building Site, Setting and Interior Spaces and Features and Finishes and UDO Section 7-11-7 (c)(4) Flexible development standards permitted for structures undergoing design review were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
  1. The new structures are in scale and designed to be compatible with the existing structures on the site.
  2. The new structures are set back behind the existing primary structure and maintain the historic relationships of structures within the setting.
  3. New trees will be planted to maintain the character of the setting.
  4. The interior changes do not damage or obscure interior spaces, features or finishes and can easily be removed without damaging historic fabric.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Kenilworth Inn local landmark.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Moffitt and carried unanimously.

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, Ms. Chase moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued, with the following condition: replanting of all trees removed as per the landscape plan submitted as a minor work. This motion was seconded by Mr. Eakins and carried unanimously.

**Preliminary Review** - None

**Other Business**

**Historic Preservation Master Plan**

Chair Ross said that the Historic Preservation Master Plan will not be considered for adoption at this meeting since there was not time to have the copies circulated to the Commission. Ms. Merten noted, however, that there were no substantive changes to what the Commission reviewed previously. After the Plan is adopted by the Commission, it will move forward to City Council Planning & Economic Development Committee for approval and then onto City Council.

## **Resolution Supporting Arts, History and Culture in Buncombe County**

Ms. Merten said that she received a call from Buncombe County Commissioner David Gantt asking for a meeting with her, Chair Ross, the Director of the Blue Ridge National Heritage area, and the Preservation Society. He presented to them a copy of the resolution, which was provided to the Commission, and encouraged the Commission to add some specifics about things the Commission wanted to work with the County on and then adopt a version of the resolution by January 20, 2015. She said that he is very interested in promoting history, arts and culture.

Assistant City Attorney Jannice Ashley said that this was the first opportunity she has had to review the proposed resolution and she felt it should be reviewed by the City Manager's Office and/or the City Attorney's Office. Some language in the proposed resolution seems to be out of scope with the authority of the Commission.

Knowing that this is a wonderful opportunity to work with the County, and after considerable discussion of the language of the proposed resolution, it was the consensus of the Commission (in order to meet the County's deadline of January 20) that the Commission direct Ms. Merten work with Ms. Ashley on crafting a letter of support including at least the following three statements and leading paragraphs to support those statements (1) The Historic Resources Commission requests the County Commission join as a partner in the application to the National Endowment of the Arts for funding to conduct a county-wide assessment of cultural resource assets, to acquire data that will support the growth of jobs in the creative sector of the economy; (2) The Historic Resources Commission requests that the County endorse the strategies outlined in the Draft Historic Preservation Master Plan when it is complete; and (3) The Historic Resources Commission desires an ongoing relationship with the County Commission to further quality of life through historic preservation, arts, history and culture.

## **Announcements**

After Ms. Merten updated the Commission on the Cabins and Castles book that will be going out of print, there was discussion on whether the City wanted to keep the copyright and reprint the book or allow them to sell it to someone else who was interested. Mr. Carpenter noted that the book is a valuable resource for document and survey of that date. Ms. Chase supported someone else purchase the copywrite which will allow them to update the book which was originally printed in 1979. It was the consensus of the Commission to direct Ms. Merten work with Mr. Carpenter (and any other Commission member who was interested) and Ms. Ashley on the existing agreement and update the Commission via e-mail.

## **Montford Gardens**

Ms. Merten said that the community wants to hire Mantis to develop a plan for use of the city-owned property in Montford (which has been used as a garden for organizations in the past), which plan (and agreement) will have to be approved by the Commission.

## **Miscellaneous**

There was a brief discussion, initiated by Mr. Carpenter, about the enforcement of landscape designs on properties, particularly noting the property at 226 Flint Street.

Chair Ross thanked Commission members who volunteered for the Montford Tour of Homes.

## **Adjournment**

At 5:25 p.m., Mr. Eakins moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Nutter and carried unanimously.